

**REMARKS**

Receipt of the Office Action of May 31, 2007 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 6-11 have been re-examined and finally rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Tamura et al.

This rejection was previously traversed and is again respectfully traversed.

It appears that the examiner does not understand the distinction that was made in the RESPONSE filed with the RCE application on April 26, 2007. In that response it was noted that "[w]hen the adaptation module is used for attachment to the hat rail, the display unit is not used," and that claim 6 was amended "to state that the display unit has a display, a keypad and a circuit board which can be mounted with the display unit but not when the adaptation module is used." In his latest rejection the examiner discusses the Tamura et al. patent indicating that it has a housing, a plurality of plug-in cards, a display unit and an adaptation module. Nothing is said, however, about the distinction made that the display unit and adaptation module are not used together.

In a further attempt to clarify this point, claim 6 has been amended again to change "connected" to "connectable". In this regard please refer to lines 5-10 on page 3 of the specification which states that "[c]onnectable with the housing 3 is an adaptation module 20," and further in lines 23-26 it is stated "[b]y simple replacement of the display unit 10 by the adaptation module 20, an existing recording device for switchboard mounting can be converted into a process automation signal processing unit for mounting on a hat rail." There can be no doubt that the display unit 10 and the adaptation module 20 are not used together.

In the ~~Response to Arguments~~ section of the Office Action, page 4, the examiner states "in response the office deems the statements as amounting to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention." It is not clear to applicant what the examiner means by a "general allegation". The statements made in the response filed with a RCE were not of a general nature. They specifically noted that the display unit 10 and the adaptation module 20 were not used together. This distinction has still not been addressed by the examiner, and hopefully, it will be addressed in reply to this

filed with a RCE were not of a general nature. They specifically noted that the display unit 10 and the adaptation module 20 were not used together. This distinction has still not been addressed by the examiner, and hopefully, it will be addressed in reply to this response resulting in the allowance of this application, or a rejection which addresses the distinction made and a reopening of prosecution since this is the second time this distinction has been noted and not addressed.

In view of the foregoing, entry of the amendment to claim 6 and the remarks made herein are respectfully requested, and this application allowed with claims 6-11, or, in the alternative, to a re-opening of prosecution to further discuss the noted issue, if the examiner believes that that is necessary.

Sincerely,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Felix J. D'Ambrosio', written over a horizontal line.

Felix J. D'Ambrosio  
Reg. No. 25,721

Date: Aug. 31, 2007

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters lane - 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 683-0500

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\SCHM3012-WT0030\Aug 31 2007 Response.wpd